

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 are pending in the current application. Claims 1, 9, and 17 are the independent claims.

The kindness and helpfulness of Examiner Hirl during the interview of Dec, 13, 2004 are acknowledged and were greatly appreciated. Dale Lazar and Lisa Norton attended the interview. The following remarks were presented at the interview.

The Office Action indicated that Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kurowski (U.S. Pub. 2002/0019844). Applicants respectfully disagree. However, the claims have been amended in order to expedite prosecution of the application.

Kurowski teaches a method and system for network-distributed computing, where a distributed computing system achieves a highly distributed environment where very large computation intensive tasks are broken down into sub-tasks and then distributed to clients running on a variety of computers across the Internet. As the Office Action states, Kurowski sends a task that does not contain both the algorithm and the data at the time it is sent from the singular sender.

Kurowski discloses a distributed computing system, in which there are at least three logical servers, namely a task server, a file server, and an application server, that are necessary to manage the task flow in the distributed computing system (See abstract, Fig. 2, Fig. 3). In Kurowski's system, there are a plurality of clients whose processors may be used to perform computations. The teaching in Kurowski is a client software downloaded on each of the clients to control communications with three different types of servers in order to achieve distributed computing (see paragraph 40). Notice here, a client machine is **required** to, via the disclosed client software, **actively initiate interactions with three types of servers** (see abstract, Fig. 3, and paragraph 61) before a client machine can start to perform computing. Particularly, when a

task server assigns a task to a client, it sends only the information that “the client needs to determine how it can run the next task: unique computational module ID; computational module version number; URL to get the computational module, ...” (See paragraph 154). That is, after contacting the task server, the client **must additionally**, on its own initiative and controlled by the client software running on the client machine, **communicate with a separate file server** to download the application module using the information provided by the task server and, furthermore, communicate with **a third separate application server** to download input data for the application module (see abstract, paragraph 61, paragraphs 154 and 155) before the client can start to perform the assigned task.


The Applicant claims a parallel data processing system, in which a single originating module sends a task comprising at least one of a plurality of algorithm portions and at least one of a plurality of data portions, all from the single originating module, to a data processing device for computation when the task is assigned to the processor of the data processing device. The processing device **does not need to separately communicate with other servers** to obtain the task instructions and the data needed in order to start to perform the assigned task.

Independent Claims 1, 9, and 17 have been amended to incorporate the feature of the task being sent from a single originating module, the task including both the algorithm and the data all from the single originating module, and are thus allowable. This feature is supported in Applicant’s specification (see, e.g., page 3, line 6 - page 4, line 6; page 4, line 7 - page 5, line 2; page 7, line 20 - page 8, line 12; page 11, lines 6-16; and page 15, lines 20-22). The remaining claims are dependent on independent Claims 1, 9, and 17, and are thus also allowable.

Applicants believe the objections and rejections in the Office Action have been addressed and that the application is now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICK LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Dale Lazar', is written over a horizontal line.

Dale Lazar

Registration No. 28,872

Attorney of Record

Lisa K. Norton

Registration No. 44,977

P.O. Box 9271
Reston, VA 20195
Telephone No. (703) 773-4164
Facsimile No. (703) 773-5000